

Appl. No. 10/688,103

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1908

II. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

After entering this amendment, claims 1-12 remain pending.

Claim Amendments

A originally filed, the application contained two claims labeled 6. As such, the second occurrence of claim 6 has been canceled and a new claim 12 has been added. The new claim 12 contains the same matter as the original second occurrence of claim 6.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent No. JP 2002263904 ("Matsumoto"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As asserted by the Examiner, Matsumoto discloses a brake disk fixed to a spindle hub in the same state as mounted on a vehicle. In other words, the brake disk of Matsumoto is turned and trued while on the vehicle. To do this, Matsumoto discloses a bearing pusher 25 and a single clamp spindle 30 cooperating to hold a brake disk 1 onto a brake hub 2. A retaining jig 34 and a spring 36, mounted to the clamp spindle 30, axially press the brake disk onto the brake hub. All of the above is done in order to machine the brake surfaces 1c. *Matsumoto*, Abstract and Figures 1 and 2. From this, it is submitted that since the brake disk of Matsumoto is already positioned on the vehicle, it is clear that Matsumoto fails to disclose both green machining and final finishing of the brake disk. Additionally, Matsumoto fails to

-5-

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610

Appl. No. 10/688,103

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1908

disclose a second working piece spindle, a drive shaft having a bell and a catching portion chucked therein in a single operation, and machining the drive shaft in that single chucking operation.

In that Matsumoto only discloses turning a brake disk while it is on a vehicle, it cannot suggest or be combined to suggest both green machining and final finishing of the brake disk in a single chucking operation, and green machining, hardening and final finishing of the drive shaft in a single chucking operation. Thus, Matsumoto cannot render the claims of the present application as obvious. The rejection under § 103 is therefore improper and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is requested.

September 13, 2005
Date

Attachments: None

EJS/DPH/AEL

Respectfully submitted,


Eric J. Sosenko (Reg. No. 34,440)